DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 360 939 HE 026 678

AUTHOR Chan, Susy; Burton, John
TITLE Faculty Vitality in the Comprehensive University: Changing Context and Concerns. AIR 1993 Annual Forum Paper.
PUB DATE May 93
NOTE 25p.; Paper presented at the Annual Forum of the Association for Institutional Research (33rd, Chicago, IL, May 16-19, 1993).
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Case Studies; Educational Environment; *Faculty College Relationship; Faculty Promotion; Faculty Workload; Higher Education; Longitudinal Studies; Models; *Productivity; Quality of Working Life; Research Universities; *Teacher Morale; Tenure
IDENTIFIERS *AIR Forum; *DePaul University IL

ABSTRACT

Central to the debates surrounding accountability, cost containment, and effectiveness in higher education are issues concerning faculty vitality and productivity. This paper proposes that the nature of faculty vitality and the interactions between individual and institutional vitality are different for comprehensive universities, particularly during a time of changing environment and institutional conditions. It first reviews various conceptual models on faculty vitality. Then, drawing from a longitudinal case study of faculty vitality issues at DePaul University (Illinois), the paper discusses how these findings relate to the existing models and the implications for comprehensive universities. Data are presented from 580 faculty respondents to 2 surveys, one conducted in 1986 and the other in 1992, revealing trends in faculty satisfaction and morale; their understanding and support of the school's mission and identity; and their attitudes regarding compensation, workload, and development. The paper concludes with some thoughts for constructing a faculty vitality model in comprehensive universities. Contains 13 references. (GLR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 360 939

Faculty Vitality in the Comprehensive University: Changing Context and Concerns

Susy Chan, Ph.D.
Vice-President for University Planning and Research

John Burton
Director, Institutional Planning and Research

DePaul University
25 E. Jackson Blvd.
Chicago, IL 60604

(312) 362-8790

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

AIR

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

HE 026 678

Paper presented at the 1993 AIR Forum, May 16-19, Chicago, Illinois

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

for Management Research, Policy Analysis, and Planning

This paper was presented at the Thirty-Third Annual Forum of the Association for Institutional Research held at the Chicago Marriott Downtown, Chicago, Illinois, May 16-19, 1993. This paper was reviewed by the AIR Forum Publications Committee and was judged to be of high quality and of interest to others concerned with the research of higher education. It has therefore been selected to be included in the ERIC Collection of Forum Papers.

Jean Endo
Chair and Editor
Forum Publications
Editorial Advisory Committee

Abstract

Heightened public attention on accountability, cost containment, and effectiveness in higher education has led to increased emphasis on improved institutional productivity. Central to these debates are issues concerning faculty vitality and productivity. While much of this attention has focused on large, research universities, these issues have an important, yet different, impact on comprehensive universities. This paper examines the changing nature of faculty vitality in the context of research universities. A longitudinal study of faculty vitality factors at an urban university and their implications will be interpreted in related conceptual models on the professorate.

Faculty Vitality in the Comprehensive University: Changing Context and Concerns

Introduction

Central to the heightened public attention on accountability and cost containment in higher education are issues concerning faculty vitality and productivity. Improved productivity, particularly, improved faculty productivity, is key to greater institutional effectiveness (Zemsky and Massey, 1990). Intertwined with this productivity issue are faculty vitality, workload, and the relationship between teaching, research, and other forms of faculty activities. While much of the national attention has focused on large, research universities, these issues have a significant yet different impact on comprehensive universities because of the renewed interest in undergraduate teaching and a paucity of models relevant to these institutions.

Both liberal arts colleges and research universities have clear institutional models and identities with well-defined missions. Research universities by definition reward research. Liberal arts colleges typically stress the small college environment tailored to undergraduate teaching. However, many comprehensive universities lack a clear definition and articulation of mission. In contrast to research universities and liberal arts colleges, Burton Clark (1993) pointed out that the institutional culture is weaker and less satisfying for many faculty members at the comprehensive universities, partly because heavy teaching loads suppress research and its rewards.

In this paper we propose that the nature of faculty vitality and the interactions between individual and institutional vitality are different for comprehensive universities, particularly during a time of changing environmental and institutional conditions. Furthermore, we suggest that institutions can develop strategies to enhance faculty vitality at both the individual and organizational levels.

We will first review various conceptual models on faculty vitality. Drawing from an institutional case study of faculty vitality issues at DePaul University, we then discuss how

these findings relate to the existing models and the implications for comprehensive universities.

Conceptual Frameworks

Vitality Level of Faculty. Most of the factors affecting faculty vitality are traceable to the academic reward system and the condition of work life. The seminal work of Clark and Corcoran (1985) on faculty vitality shows that there is a range of individual and organizational variables that distinguish highly active faculty from their peers at *research oriented* universities. The "vital" faculty are those who demonstrate sustained productivity in their teaching, research, and professional services. These faculty tend to exhibit either a relatively even division of interests between teaching and research, or a skewed preference toward research. Organizational variables, stressing the institutional support for faculty's scholarly activities including research libraries, the quality of graduate students, and sabbatical leaves, are deemed essential for sustaining faculty vitality.

Researchers argue that faculty vitality is a multidimensional theoretical concept, and faculty and institutional vitality are interrelated (Clark, Boyer, and Corcoran, 1985; Clark, Corcoran, and Lewis, 1986). However, this model tends to emphasize the individual dimensions -- the faculty's role as scholarly researcher and research productivity--as measures of quality; it views the organizational dimensions as less important. Therefore, they suggested that university mission should be directed at fostering an active scholarly environment to support the research activities of the faculty.

Nevertheless, Clark and Corcoran recognized that their model of faculty vitality would not fit all institutions. Instead, ideal types of vital faculty will differ according to institutional type and mission (Clark, Boyer, and Corcoran, 1985; Clark, Corcoran, and Lewis, 1986). These researchers assumed that teaching and service would play a more central role in ensuring faculty vitality in non-research oriented institutions. But they did not study how the vitality variables change in different contexts.

Baldwin (1990) extended this inquiry to professors at *liberal arts* colleges and found contextual differences in how vital professors define their work as compared to those in the research universities. Based on Baldwin's research, three sets of factors distinguish vital from representative professors at the liberal arts colleges.

- o Vital faculty tend to lead a more diversified work life. While placing the highest priority on instruction, they work longer hours, and invest more time in their professional roles (including research activities).
- o Vital faculty take fuller advantage of opportunities available in their work environments, seek out external resources, and identify professional growth opportunities.
- o Vital faculty tend to set clearer short and long-term goals for academic career development, have more fluid careers, and are more enterprising and risk-taking with innovative opportunities.

Vital faculty, perceived as "star performers" by their colleagues, demonstrate a more diversified and probably a more balanced work life, able to integrate teaching, professional service, and scholarly pursuit. They spent 10 percent more time in research than their representative colleagues while the latter spent 10 percent more time in teaching.

Baldwin's findings are more relevant to comprehensive universities because of their shared emphasis on teaching. This inquiry also confirms that research and traditional scholarship is deemed a more prestigious faculty activity even in liberal arts colleges. Thus how to effectively integrate teaching and research and what form of collaboration become critical issues.

Correlates of Faculty Vitality. Faculty vitality can also be analyzed in terms of tangible and intangible correlates (Schuster, 1985). Tangible correlates, such as compensation and work load, are more apparent and often requires institutional resource support. Intangible correlates, such as a sense of community and leadership, often reflect attitudes and an institutional culture. Bevan (1985) further examined faculty vitality in

relation to the faculty reward structure. Direct incentives are the crucial elements of traditional faculty reward structure and indirect ones reflect the institutional environment.

Therefore, most of the common correlates of faculty vitality can be grouped according to their relationship to requirement for resource support and to the reward structure in the following matrix:

Relationship to Reward Structure	Relationship to Resource Support: Tangible	Relationship to Resource Support: Intangible
Direct	compensation work load teaching/research support faculty development opportunities clerical/research assistance	tenure & promotion release time recognition sabbatical
Indirect	facilities equipment library support membership in faculty club intellectual freedom student research	faculty forum quality of faculty & students clarity in mission sense of community

Figure 1. Correlates of Faculty Vitality

Direct correlates, whether tangible or intangible, are, traditionally, the most crucial to individual faculty vitality and often occupy a higher priority in institutional agenda. These are the correlates underscored in Clark and Corcoran's study of the University of Minnesota. However, there is also a qualitative and a contextual dimension to faculty vitality. Faculty vitality is more than measurable indicators for individuals, such as productivity or workload; intangible issues, such as a "balanced" workload and tenure and promotion criteria, play a greater importance at the institutional level. How these

correlates play out in research oriented universities, liberal arts colleges, and comprehensive universities has different implications (Baldwin, 1992).

Taking this contextual difference one step further, it is possible that, even within the same institution, the dynamics of these correlates may change over time. During a time of rapid institutional change, indirect, intangible correlates, such as the clarity of mission, congruence of institutional culture and faculty expectation could become more critical than they would be during a time of stability (Chan, 1988).

Vitality Indicators. Taking institutional type and mission into account, Clark and Lewis (1988) proposed a slightly different set of indicators. They developed five contextual indicators to measure faculty vitality. These indicators are:

1. *Institutional Success* emphasizes the close connection between institutional mission and faculty vitality. Faculty vitality is dependent on institutional success, and the institutional mission will determine the expectations of the faculty.
2. *Career Development* is closely connected with the tenure and promotion system and reflect the faculty's desire to continue to progress in their careers and not become "stuck" in the promotion ladder.
3. *Satisfaction and Morale* measures both the faculty members' sense of well-being and their relationship to the organization. Morale is often connected to the faculty's role in university governance and faculty development.
4. *Obsolescence* is ill-defined but is most closely connected to faculty development, a direct tangible indicator of vitality. It recognizes that over time faculty members need to retool and expand their knowledge in order to maintain their vitality.
5. *Aging* has biological, psychological, and economic dimensions. For most faculty there are limited biological and psychological constraints to productivity, but

economic indicators, particularly the flattening of income and earnings over time (including salary compression) can affect faculty vitality.

These indicators can fit easily into the matrix of vitality correlates as discussed above: institutional success Indicators (intangible, indirect), satisfaction & morale and career development indicators (intangible, direct), and obsolescence and aging indicators (tangible, direct).

Clark and Lewis (1988) suggested that intangible indicators play far more important roles in setting faculty expectation than previous research has acknowledged. Furthermore, they argued that an institution can manage vitality through deliberate strategies.

While the faculty vitality model applicable to research oriented universities has focused primarily on individual vitality issues, an institutional approach, focused on the indirect, intangible correlates seem more pertinent for comprehensive universities. We consider that institutional vitality, in the form of clarity of university mission and strategic direction should be closely linked to individual vitality in comprehensive universities. Institutional success indicators could directly affect the nature and interrelationship among other correlates. We will discuss this perspective in the following institutional case study to illustrate the contextual differences of faculty vitality factors.

An Institutional Case Study of DePaul University

Methodology and Data Sources. This case study incorporates two surveys of full-time faculty at DePaul University over a six year period of time. The first survey was conducted in 1986, in conjunction with DePaul's North Central Association accreditation review. Four hundred and four (404) faculty members were surveyed and 283 responded (70% response rate). The survey was repeated in 1992 to assess the DePaul's faculty response to its most recent strategic planning initiatives and solicit faculty input on key planning issues. Four hundred and eighty-seven (487) faculty members were surveyed and 297 participated in the study (61% response rate). Only individuals with full-time faculty appointments

were surveyed; deans and vice-presidents who held faculty rank were not included. Both surveys were mailed through campus mail during the spring term with one follow-up survey.

Both survey instruments included a battery of questions on the faculty perception of university environment, their role of teaching, research, and service in tenure, promotion and salary review, faculty attitudes toward their workload and institutional support for teaching and research, faculty support for program review and post-tenure review, the faculty governance process, and the faculty's assessment of institutional goals. Although the two surveys were not entirely identical, a common set of questions were included to allow for an examination of the changes in vitality factors and the relationship between indicators for faculty vitality and institutional effectiveness over a six year period. In this paper, we will only discuss findings that are most relevant to the conceptual framework.

Institutional Context. DePaul University is an urban, comprehensive university located in Chicago. Its student enrollment in fall term 1992 was 16,500. The university has traditionally placed the highest priority in teaching over research. Its strong commitment to an urban mission is manifested through a diverse student body, curriculum coverage, and service to the community.

In its effort to reposition the university, DePaul did not embrace the model of the research university, but instead maintained its emphasis on strong teaching, personal service, and its urban commitment. According to DePaul's mission statement, the university "places highest priority on programs of instruction and learning." In addition, the statement notes as DePaul's distinguishing marks: religious pluralism, personalized service, and an urban character.

From 1986 to 1992, DePaul experienced dramatic growth and increased quality in its student body. Student enrollment grew by 25%, with much of this growth concentrated in the liberal arts and sciences majors, which grew by 29%. The number of full-time faculty grew by 22%, with most of the new positions in the liberal arts and sciences. Overall, DePaul's undergraduate students were better prepared than their counterparts six years

ago. Academic indicators for new freshmen increased consistently each year during this period.

DePaul also expanded its academic facilities -- a new library, improved classroom space, faculty offices, and academic computing facilities. Although DePaul was unable to reduce the average faculty teaching load -- which remained constant at about six courses per year in the College of Liberal Arts, seven courses in the College of Commerce -- full-time faculty salaries increased in real terms by 22%. The university was also able to resolve a number of salary compression concerns during this period.

These institutional changes created a different university environment than assumed in many of the earlier vitality models. Clark and Lewis's model (1988) based on a series of unfavorable environmental assumptions reflecting the constraints of the early 1980s, including faculty salary erosion, stagnation in new hires, and level or declining liberal arts enrollments. Similarly, Bowen and Schuster (1986) described a professorate with unclear or shifting sense of values, low morale and job satisfaction, financial concerns related to salary erosion, and a sense of "stuckness" or career immobility.

However, like DePaul University, many comprehensive universities did not experience this plight during the 1980s. On the contrary, these institutions undertook aggressive strategies in enrollment management, pricing, fund raising, and program expansion to successfully reposition themselves in a competitive marketplace. As a result, they experienced enrollment growth, not declines. Meanwhile, national studies have indicated that undergraduate interest in the liberal arts and education increased, while interest in many professional programs, particularly business, declined (Dey, Astin, Korn & Riggs, 1992). Furthermore, during the late 1980s and early 1990s real faculty earnings increased. Therefore, the unfavorable assumptions underlying the research and strategies for faculty vitality did not apply to DePaul and many urban comprehensive universities.

Major Findings

From 1986 to 1992, there were remarkable improvements in many of DePaul's faculty vitality indicators. However, despite these positive changes, there are also growing incongruence in other vitality measures. These shifts provided important insights into the nature of faculty vitality and relationship among vitality factors at DePaul.

Satisfaction and Morale. As shown in Table 1, compared to 1986, more faculty saw DePaul as an attractive place to work (71% in 1986, 93% in 1992). More faculty members said that their peers at other institutions saw DePaul as an excellent institution (30% in 1986, 65% in 1992). The strategic enhancements in numerous areas, as described earlier, had improved the faculty's overall satisfaction.

Table 1. Faculty Satisfaction and Morale.

	1986 Strongly Agree/ Agree	1992 Strongly Agree/ Agree
All things considered, DePaul is an attractive place to work as a faculty member.	71%	93%
DePaul has impressed me as a place committed to personalized service to the individual	68%	87%
DePaul has impressed me as a community of scholars with a strong sense of scholarly commitment.	40%	71%
Peers in my academic field at other institutions generally perceive DePaul as an excellent place to work	30%	65%

Institutional Mission and Identity. Although the faculty's understanding of the university mission has been a crucial element in ensuring faculty vitality (Clark and Lewis 1988, Chan 1988), this correlate received less attention in previous research. In the 1992 faculty survey, survey respondents overwhelmingly saw DePaul as embodying its distinguishing marks (see Table 2). Overall, faculty were supportive of the university's teaching mission and the direction of the repositioning, and they developed greater affiliation with the institutional culture and values. This understanding of the mission was

connected to the reasons faculty came to DePaul. About half of the respondents in both 1986 and 1992 reported being attracted to DePaul because of its emphasis on teaching.

Table 2. Faculty Perception of the University Mission.

	1992 Strongly Agree/ Agree
DePaul is able to balance its fidelity to the Christian message with its commitment to religious pluralism.	91%
The DePaul community shows respect for the dignity of each individual.	90%
DePaul has impressed me a place committed to personalized service to the individual.	87%
DePaul effectively uses the resources of the city to support its academic programs.	80%

Faculty Compensation, Workload and Development. During this period, average faculty compensation increased by 22% in real term. While in 1986 64% of faculty would be attracted to other universities with better salary and benefits, in 1992 only 52% indicated this possibility. In 1986, 25% of faculty were attracted to DePaul by its compensation as compared to 29% in 1992. These indicators confirmed the salary intervention strategies that DePaul employed have helped to improve faculty vitality.

In terms of scholarly research activities, most of indicators were higher in 1992 than in 1986. As shown in Table 3, the percentage of faculty presenting papers in the past two years (56% in 1986, 75% in 1992), the percentage authoring or co-authoring a book (62% in 1986, 72% in 1992), and the percentage applying for external funding (28% in 1986, 43% in 1992) all improved.

Although faculty research productivity increased at DePaul, this improvement did not necessarily translate into enhanced faculty vitality. While nearly 60% of the faculty believed teaching and research complemented each other at DePaul, in 1992, only 37% of DePaul's faculty believed they were able to effectively balance teaching and research in

Table 3. Faculty Professional Activities, 1990–92

	1986	1992
Attended a professional meeting or conference	88.3%	92.3%
Presented a paper at a professional meeting/conference or presented research/performed at another university or institution by invitation	55.5%	75.1%
Authored or co–authored a book, a published article, a research monograph or a book review article	61.6%	71.8%
Served on an editorial board or reviewed articles for a professional publication or foundation or government agency	40.2%	47.3%
Submitted grant proposals for external funding	27.8%	43.0%
Served as an officer or committee member in a professional organization	41.6%	36.4%
Organized a professional conference/seminar	34.5%	34.3%
Conducted research or taught outside the United States	NA	26.9%
Received external funding for research/creative activity or for program development	17.8%	24.5%
Directed, designed, produced, or appeared in a public performance	21.4%	17.4%
Conducted field research with a corporation	NA	8.8%
Produced a published script, score, or recording or had a script or score offered in public performance	4.6%	6.4%

their load (see Table 4). This discrepancy highlights that a balanced workload is as important as research productivity for faculty at comprehensive universities.

Table 4. Faculty Perceptions of DePaul's Support for Teaching and Research.

	1992 Strongly Agree/ Agree
Teaching and research complement each other at DePaul.	58%
DePaul's workload effectively balances teaching, research, academic advising & committee work.	37%

At DePaul, the faculty course-load had remained constant since the mid-1980s, reflecting the institution's continued priority to instruction. However, faculty felt there was an incongruence between their desired and actual workload. While wanting instruction to remain their primary focus, they desired to spend about 10% less time on teaching and 10% more time on research (see Tables 5). This finding echoes Baldwin's (1990) research at liberal arts colleges, that time distribution of "vital" faculty is what majority of faculty members desire to emulate. Overall, the faculty at DePaul wanted to maintain the centrality of teaching and instruction, yet they desired to adjust their workload to allow for greater research.

Table 5. Faculty Workload Distribution.

	1986 Current%	1992 Current%	1992 Desired%
Teaching/course Preparation	48.2%	46.7%	38.7%
Research/creative activity	17.8%	16.9%	27.2%
University Service/committee work/administration	15.3%	16.4%	11.2%
Non-classroom contact with students	9.4%	10.7%	10.8%
Professional contact with DPU faculty members	5.4%	5.7%	7.1%
Community service	3.4%	3.6%	5.0%

The Tenure and Promotion Criteria. The reinvigoration of the university's mission with its emphasis on teaching has to be translated into the tenure, promotion and merit review criteria and processes in order to ensure faculty vitality. However, the 1992 faculty

survey found that this linkage was not adequately established, thus resulting in heightened faculty tension and stress.

What we have found in the longitudinal data set are several trends. First of all, as shown in Table 1, teaching continued to be weighted as the most important faculty activity despite the changes during this period. As shown in Table 6, faculty assigned a "desired" weight of 3.8 on a 4.0 scale to the importance of teaching in the tenure decision in both 1986 and 1992. The desired weight for teaching in the promotion process received similarly consistent weight. In other areas of faculty activities -- research, administrative work, and public services -- the desired weights remained remarkably close from 1986 to 1992, despite the changes in the composition of faculty over the six year period.

This pattern of relative importance of teaching as compared to research and services are consistent with the DePaul's institutional mission and priorities. However, there is continuing incongruence between desired and perceived importance of teaching in the tenure and promotion processes. In 1986, this discrepancy was 1.0 point for tenure and promotion decisions (2.8 perceived versus 3.8 desired). In 1992, there is slight improvement but still sizable differences. There was 0.8 point of discrepancy for tenure and promotion decisions.

Although research was perceived to receive slightly greater weight for tenure and promotion decisions than faculty have desired, the discrepancy between desired and perceived weight is very small. In terms of faculty perception of how teaching, research, and services were weighted in the current tenure and promotion processes at the university and college levels, both teaching and research activities now received greater attention than in 1986. However, faculty perceived that the importance of teaching is lessened as the review process moves from the college to university levels.

Implications

This case study of DePaul's faculty revealed noticeable improvement in both individual and institutional vitality factors -- compensation, research productivity,

Table 6. Faculty Perceptions of the Perceived vs. the Desired Current Review Process

4 = Most Important; 3 = Moderately Important; 2 = Slightly Important; 1 = Not Important

	********** LEVEL **********					
	University		College		Desired	Desired
Tenure	1986*	1992	1986*	1992	1986**	1992**
teaching effectiveness	2.8	3.0	3.1	3.4	3.8	3.8
research, scholarship, creative pursuits	3.3	3.5	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.4
administrative and committee work	2.4	2.0	2.5	2.4	2.4	2.4
public service	1.8	1.7	1.8	1.7	2.0	1.9
Promotion						
teaching effectiveness	2.8	2.9	3.1	3.4	3.8	3.7
research, scholarship, creative pursuits	3.3	3.6	3.3	3.4	3.3	3.4
administrative and committee work	2.4	2.1	2.5	2.3	2.4	2.5
public service	1.8	1.7	1.8	1.7	2.0	1.9

* In the 1986 data tenure and promotion were combined.
** The desired weights respresent an overall institutional perception.

satisfaction and morale, clarity in mission, and sense of community. However, not all the faculty vitality factors show the same degree of improvement, particularly those most closely related to the tenure and promotion system, suggesting comprehensive universities, like DePaul, may face particular problems with ensuring faculty vitality. For example, increased research productivity alone cannot be viewed as a sign of improved faculty vitality in comprehensive universities. Instead, faculty at these institutions try to balance the emphasis on teaching and research.

Often the tangible and direct correlates of faculty satisfaction are central measures of faculty vitality in the research university model. However, these correlates are not always the most important indicators in comprehensive universities. Instead, indirect factors play a more important role in faculty vitality at comprehensive universities than they do at other types of institutions. Although research productivity improved at DePaul, this increased productivity did not necessarily improve faculty vitality. A more balanced workload may play a more important role in improving overall faculty vitality.

On face value, the model of faculty vitality in comprehensive institutions seems to mirror liberal arts colleges emphasis on the balance of teaching and research, rather than the research university model's emphasizes on research and professional productivity. However, one important area of faculty interest differentiates liberal arts institutions from comprehensive universities -- the emphasis on public service. Public service initiatives are particularly identified with urban comprehensive institutions. At DePaul, public service initiatives are closely connected to the urban mission of the institution. Most faculty endorsed these change and 86% saw public service as an important element in DePaul's mission and 61% felt that faculty should be more involved in public service. Although 90% of the faculty felt that public service connected to professional expertise of faculty should play a role in the tenure and promotion process, faculty gave it very little weight compared to teaching and research. Nevertheless, commitment to public service distinguishes urban

comprehensive universities, and there has been a greater expectation at DePaul that the faculty will be actively involved in public service.

The DePaul faculty saw several sets of discontinuities: one between their desired and perceived tenure and promotion criteria, and the other between the tenure and promotion criteria at the university and the college levels. These discontinuities led to increased faculty frustration. The pressure on DePaul's faculty, particularly the junior faculty approaching tenure increased during the period. The faculty maintained their course-load while increasing their professional activities. The DePaul faculty changed and became more vital, according to the research model, increasing faculty expectations. These pressures manifested themselves in the reward structure. Although the desired review criteria remained relatively constant, the faculty perceived a shift in the role of teaching in the tenure and promotion process. Institutional efforts have not been able to rectify this inconsistency. The tenure and promotion system had not fully embodied the mission and institutional direction developed through the strategic planning process and therefore did not fully promote faculty vitality.

Much of these tensions were the result of the lack of integration between the intangible and indirect correlates (institutional mission and identity) and the intangible and direct correlate (the tenure and promotion system). In order to ensure faculty vitality, the balance between teaching and research articulated in the university's mission needs to be translated into the rewards and workload structure. If not, faculty vitality will be hampered even if research productivity increases.

Conclusions: A Model of Faculty Vitality in Comprehensive Universities

These findings suggest that a model of faculty vitality for comprehensive universities can be constructed based on the previous research, but should recognize the particular mission and directions of these institutions. In comprehensive universities, intangible and indirect correlates play a central role in defining faculty vitality; emphasis must be given to the articulation of institutional mission and direction. If the institutional priorities are not

clearly stated, discontinuities in the other vitality factors, particularly those in the tenure and promotion system and the faculty development and workload may occur.

In determining the tenure and promotion system, the challenge for comprehensive universities is both resist adopting the review criteria of research universities while working to create a rewards structure that more closely assimilate the faculty's perceived and desired review criteria. The tenure and promotion system must reflect the university mission and balance teaching and research appropriately. Comprehensive universities mirror the liberal arts college vitality model, placing highest priority on teaching, but recognize the importance of research and professional vitality. Ideally, the faculty workload should support the institutional mission and the tenure and promotion system; quantitative or qualitative evaluations of research productivity alone will be insufficient measures of faculty vitality.

Comprehensive universities need to integrate teaching and scholarship in order to effectively balance the faculty workload. With their emphasis on both teaching and research, comprehensive universities may be particularly well placed to use Ernest Boyer's provocative model for integrating teaching and research. If teaching and research can be more closely intertwined, greater scholarship need not come at the expense of teaching. DePaul adopted the concept of a "community of learners." Faculty, as scholars, should relate their scholarship and learning closely to student learning and engage students in scholarly pursuit. As argued by Boyer, the integration of teaching and other forms of scholarship can be embraced easily at the conceptual level, but needs much clarification in practice on how the various forms of scholarship should be defined, evaluated, and rewarded. These definitions, evaluations, and rewards need to grow out of the particular priorities of comprehensive institutions in order to be effective.

In institutions going through repositioning or clarification of institutional direction, particular attention needs to be focused on the faculty's changing expectations that could heighten tensions. In spite of tangible improvement in faculty life at DePaul (increased

salaries, improved facilities), not all indicators of faculty vitality improved from 1986 to 1992. Intangible correlates of faculty vitality, particularly the tenure and promotion system, played a key effect on institutional vitality.

References

Baldwin, Roger (1990). Faculty Vitality beyond the Research University: Extending a Contextual Concept. The Journal of Higher Education, 61, 160-180.

Bevan, John M (1985). Who has the Role of Building Incentives? In Roger W. Baldwin (Ed.), Incentives for Faculty Vitality (pp.45-57). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bowen, Howard, and Schuster, Jack (1986). American Professors: A National Resource Imperiled. New York: Oxford University Press.

Boyer, Ernest (1990). Scholarship Reconsidered. New York: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Chan, Susy (1988). Faculty Participation in Strategic Planning: Incentives and Strategies. Planning for Higher Education 16, 19-30.

Clark, Burton R (1993). Faculty: Differentiation and Dispersion. In Arthur Levine (Ed.), Higher Learning in American, 1980-2000 (pp. 163-178). Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Clark, Shirley M., and Corcoran, Mary (1985). Individual and Organizational Contributions to Faculty Vitality: An Institutional Case Study. In Shirley M. Clark & Darrell Lewis (Eds.), Faculty Vitality and Institutional Productivity: Critical Perspectives for Higher Education (pp. 112-138). New York: Teachers College Press.

Clark, Shirley M., Boyer, Carol M., and Corcoran, Mary (1985). Faculty and Institutional Vitality in Higher Education. In Shirley M. Clark & Darrell Lewis (Eds.), Faculty Vitality and Institutional Productivity: Critical Perspectives for Higher Education (pp. 3-24). New York: Teachers College Press.

Clark, Shirley M., Corcoran, Mary, and Lewis, Darrell (1986). The Case for an Institutional Perspective on Faculty Development. Journal of Higher Education 57, 176-195.

Clark, Shirley M., and Lewis, Darrell R (1988). *Faculty Vitality: Context, Concerns, and Prospects.* In John C. Smart (Ed), Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research, Vol. IV (pp. 282-318), New York: Agathon Press, 1988.

Dey, Eric L, Astin, Alexander W., Korn, William S., & Riggs, Ellyne R (1992). The American Freshmen. Los Angeles: American Council on Education & The University of California.

Zemsky, Robert and Massy, William (1990, November/December). "Cost Containment: Committing to the New Economic Reality." Change, pp 16-22.

Schuster, Jack H (1985). Faculty Vitality: Observations from the Field. In Roger W. Baldwin (Ed.), Incentives for Faculty Vitality, (pp. 21-32). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.